

Application No.: **10/522,437**

Response to Office Action of March 23, 2007

Attorney Docket: NOTAR-019US

REMARKS:

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.114, Applicant requests continued examination of the above-identified application. This request for continued examination is responsive to the outstanding Office Action mailed on March 23, 2007. Applicant additionally submits concurrently herewith the fee set forth in §1.17(e). Moreover, this request for continued examination is being submitted prior to the abandonment of the application. Hence, the request for continued examination should be granted.

I. SUMMARY OF OFFICE ACTION MAILED ON MARCH 23, 2007

In the Office Action, Claims 1, 4 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1, 4 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Muller (U.S. Patent No. 5,901,597) in view of Nota (U.S. Patent No. 3,251,213), Engel (U.S. Patent No. 4,791,799) and Kishikawa (U.S. Patent No. 4,503,699). Claim 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over IDS Citation JP03-86301 in view of Nota.

II. APPLICANT'S RESPONSE

A. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §112

In the Office Action, Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. In response, Applicant has amended the first step of Claim 1 to recite the step of, “performing a first rolling passage in said two-high edging stand.” Applicant respectfully submits that such amendment overcomes the objection over Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §112.

Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of Claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph has been overcome by the amendment of Claim 1.

Moreover, Applicant has amended the first step of Claim 12 to recite, “said first rolling passage in said two-high edging stand on exiting from a pre-rough rolling station.” Moreover, the

Application No.: 10/522,437

Response to Office Action of March 23, 2007

Attorney Docket: NOTAR-019US

fourth step recited in Claim 12 has been amended to recite, "said second rolling passage in said two-high edging stand." Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of Claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph has been overcome.

In relation to Claim 17, Applicant has amended the specification, as identified above to recite the subject matter of Claim 17 that the Examiner contends was not described in the specification. The support for the amendment to the specification may be found in Claim 18 as originally filed. Hence, the rejection of Claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. §112, First Paragraph has been overcome.

B. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

In the Office Action Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Muller, in view of Nota, Engel and Kishkawa. Applicant respectfully submits that the cited prior art does not disclose all of the limitations recited in Claim 1. In particular, Claim 1 recites the step of performing a first rolling passage. The first rolling passage is performed in a two-high edging stand and a second universal stand. Claim 1 further recites a second rolling passage. The second rolling passage is performed in the second universal stand, the two-high edging stand, and a first universal stand. Claim 1 also recites that the reduction ratio of the second universal stand is greater than the reduction ratio of the first universal stand.

The cited prior art, namely, the Engel Patent (U.S. Patent No. 4,791,799) explains that the reduction ratio of the first universal stand is greater than the reduction ratio of the second universal stand. This is explained at Col. 3, Lines 50-61 of the Engel Patent. Moreover, this is opposite to the relative reduction ratios of the first and second universal stands recited in Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited prior art, including, the Engel Patent does not disclose, suggest or make obvious the limitation that the reduction ratio of the second universal stand be greater than the reduction ratio of the first universal stand. Hence, Claim 1 is believed to be in condition for allowance.

III. CONCLUSION

For the forgoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1, 4 and 12 are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any suggestions for expediting allowance of

Application No.: **10/522,437**

Response to Office Action of March 23, 2007

Attorney Docket: NOTAR-019US

the above-identified application, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's representative at the telephone number listed below.

Should any additional fee be required, please charge deposit account number 19-4330.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 20, 2007

By:

Customer No.: 007663



Kit M. Stetina, Esq., Reg. No. 29,445
STETINA BRUNDA GARRED & BRUCKER
75 Enterprise, Suite 250
Aliso Viejo, California 92656
(949) 855-1246